



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,433	04/27/2000	Robert D. Gardos	81866.0023	4314

26021 7590 09/24/2003

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.  
500 S. GRAND AVENUE  
SUITE 1900  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2611

EXAMINER
----------

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/560,433

Applicant(s)

GARDOS ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to Request for Consideration filed 7/10/2003 (paper # 6). Claims 1-42 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereby the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-35, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneider US pat. No.6,338,082.

As to claim 1, Schneider discloses a plurality of modifiable domain name records in a database

in concurrence with a DNS root server (120' fig. 1 a), the database storing first and second records corresponding to a first domain name and a second domain name (i.e., addresses of domain names) comprising:

accepting a command from the client machine (110 fig. 1a) to modify the first record and replace it with a modified record (i.e., using browser to modify a domain name, col.5 lines 37-65) (see also fig.1a, abstract, col.8 line 51 to col.9 line 44 and col.10 lines 19-65).

accepting a command from the client machine to apply the modification of the first record to the second record and storing the modified record in place of each of the first and second records in the database (i.e., storing domain names is received as input to a registration service, see figs.1b, 1c, col.10 line 66 to col.12 line 56).

causing the records in the DNS root server to be substantially in agreement with the modified database records (see col.12 line 57 to col.13 line 25 and col.13 line 46 to col.14 line 55).

As to claim 2, Schneider discloses sending the first record for the first domain name and second record for the second domain name, the records associated with the database, to a client machine responsive to a client machine prompt (see fig.2b, col.12 line 57 to col.13 line 25).

As to claims 3 and 4, Schneider further discloses that the steps are performed by a program residing on the web server and includes stored procedures (see col.3 line 11 to col.14 line 65).

As to claims 5 and 6, Schneider discloses causing the modified records to be stored in an authoritative registry server which is a registrar Whois database (see fig.5c, col.10 lines 19-65 and col.14 lines 21-65).

As to claims 8-11, Schneider discloses the domain record is an IP address, a domain name, a canonical name, a mail exchange and a contact record (see fig.2b, col.10 line 6 to col.11 line 52 and col.12 line 54 to col.13 line 67).

As to claim 12, Schneider discloses the contact record is selected from the group consisting of zone, organization, administrative, billing and technical (see col.4 line 13 to col.5 line 65 and col.12 line 57 to col.13 line 55).

As to claim 13, Schneider discloses the domain record is selected from the group consisting of primary DNS, secondary DNS, DNS mail, refresh time, retry interval, expire time and time to live (i.e., rates, times and expiration dates, see fig.2a, col.4 line 13 to col.5 line 65, col.11 line 8 to col.12 line 56 and col.14 lines 1-65).

As to claim 14, Schneider discloses a plurality of modifiable domain name records in a database in concurrence with a DNS root server (120' fig. 1a), generating a graphical user interface displaying the domain records related to the database on the display (i.e., using handheld device or PDA) comprising: accessing the first domain record in the database (see col.8 line 51 to col.9 line 44). displaying the graphical user interface (GUI) on the display (i.e., inherently from the

Art Unit: 2155

use of hand held device or PDA, see ccol.9 line 3 to col.10 line 55), the GUI having a field in which the first record is displayed (see also col.16 lines 7-23). displaying a modified record in the; field in response to a user input, storing the modified record in the database in place of the first record and causing the replacement of the first record in the DNS root server with the modified record (see fig. 1c, col.1 1 line 8 to col.12 line 56).

As to claim 15, Schneider discloses the first record is associated with an account name and the step of accessing requires input of the account name to access the record (see fig.2b, col.12 line 14 to col.13 line 45 and col.14 lines 1-55)..

As to claims 16 and 17, Schneider discloses the computer system further including a web server, steps are performed by a program residing on the web server and display residing on a client computer that is networked to the computer system through the web server.(see fig. 1a, col.9 line 15 to col.10 line 55).

As to claims 18 and 19, Schneider discloses a plurality of domain records are stored in the database (122 fig. 1c) and a plurality of fields (see fig.1b, col.10 line 56 to col.1 1 line 52).

As to claim 20, Schneider further discloses accessing the second domain record in the database and displaying the second record in a second field of the GUI (*i.e., inherently from the display hand held device or PDA*, see col.9 line 3 to col.10 line 55) and displaying the modified record in the second field in response to a user input, and wherein the step of "storing" further includes

storing the modified record in the database in place of the second record, and wherein the step of "causing" further includes causing the replacement of the second record in the DNS root server with the modified record (*i.e., using modifications to process name resolution and registration services, see col.12 line 57 to col.13 line 55 and col.13 line 46 to col.14 line 55*).

Claims 21-28 and 30 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 7-14 and 9 respectively.

As to claims 29 and 31-33, Schneider further discloses a change address view, a welcome screen, a change contact record view and a change mail exchange view (see fig.5c, col.9 line 15 to col.10 line 65 and col.14 line 21 to col.15 line 63).

As to claim 34, Schneider discloses a program code for using a graphics device in generating a graphical user interface (GUI) on the display device (*i.e., using PDA or hand held device, col.9 line 3 to col.10 line 55*) for presenting a domain record stored in a domain database containing a plurality of domain records (addresses of domain names), the records in occurrence with records stored in a DNS root server comprising: a program code for accessing the database and displaying a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device, the GUI having; a field in which the domain name is displayed (*Le., using PDA or hand held device, col.9 line 3 to col.10 line 55*) (see fig.1a, abstract, col.8 line 51 to col.9 line 44). program code for modifying the domain in the field in response to user input (using DNS query message) (*i.e., using browser to modify a domain name, see col.5 lines 37-65 and col.10 line 19 to col.11 line 52*). program for replacing the domain record in the database with the modified record (see col.11 line 33 to col.12 line 56).

program code for causing replacement of the domain record stored in the DNS root server with the modified domain record (see col.1 line 57 to col.3 line 25 and col.13 line 46 to col.14 line 55).

As to claim 35, Schneider further discloses accessing the database is a database application program (see fig.4a, col.13 line 26 to col.14 line 55 and col.15 lines 8-62).

As to claims 38 and 39, Schneider discloses modifying the domain record in the field is a utility program and a common gateway interface (CGI) program (see col.1 line 45 to col.2 line 59 and col.15 lines 8-62).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 36, 37 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider US pat. No.6,338,082.



Art Unit: 2155

Schneider discloses a parse for parsing text formatted in data application such that Perl (see col.11 lines 9-65 and col.14 line 1 to col.15 line 63) and flat files that updates a Shared Registration System Application program (i.e., using DNS Registration, see fig.2b, col.12 line 14 to col.13 line 67 and col.15 lines 8-62). Schneider does not specifically disclose using other programming language such as PL-SQL, Visual Builder and C program. However, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize either programming language above depending on the choice of computer programmers, and still achieve the same end results.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/10/2003 (paper # 6) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant asserts that the Office Action failed to provide copies of the provisional applications in the Schneider reference.

*The U.S. Provisional Applications are generally available to the public. The MPEP does not require the Examiner to provide the copy of the Provisional Application.*

*Applicant is advised to contact the U.S. Office of Publications to get the copies. The rejection is respectfully stands until Applicant points out the different between the U.S. Pat. No.6,338,082 (Schneider) and the corresponding US Provisional Applications.*

b. Applicant further asserts that the Schneider reference does not disclose DNS root server and managing multiple domain names.

*Examiner respectfully disagrees. Schneider discloses a DNS server (120' fig.1) connected to the network having a DNS records that translate domain names into IP addresses as applicant claimed invention (see col.9 line 3 to col.10 line 65 and col.12 line 57 to col.13 line 25) and managing multiple domain names from different users (see col.11 line 9 to col.12 line 56 and col.13 line 26 to ocl.14 line 65).*

c. Applicant further asserts that the Schneider reference does not disclose "storing the modified record in place of each of the first and second records in the database and causing the records to the DNS root server to be in substantially in agreement with the modified database records".

*Examiner points out Schneider discloses that the DNS server (120 fig.1) having a distributed database (124 fig.1) to allow host and name servers to communicate in order to provide the translation service for users' requests (including first and second request) and storing domain names as input to a registration service (see figs.1b, 1c, col.10 line 66 to col.12 line 56).*

### **Conclusion**

7. Claims 1-42 are rejected.
8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2155

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam Hosain, can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for this group are:

After Final: (703) 746-7238

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official/ Draft: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Khanh Dinh  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2155  
9/16/2002

  
**HOSAIN ALAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**